

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

AARON TREDENICK,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	No. 1:23-cv-785
)	
-v-)	
)	Honorable Paul L. Maloney
NATIONWIDE AGRIBUSINESS)	
INSURANCE COMPANY,)	
Defendant.)	
)	

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Defendant Nationwide filed a motion for summary judgment addressing the only claim remaining in this lawsuit, a breach of a confidentiality agreement (ECF No. 72). The Magistrate Judge issued a report recommending the Court grant Defendant’s motion (ECF No. 84 - amended report and recommendation). Plaintiff Aaron TreDenick filed objections (ECF No. 85). Defendant filed a response to Plaintiff’s objections (ECF No. 86). The Court will adopt the report and recommendation and will grant Defendant’s motion for summary judgment.

After being served with a report and recommendation (R&R) issued by a magistrate judge, a party has fourteen days to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). A district court judge reviews de novo the portions of the R&R to which objections have been filed. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Only those objections that are specific are entitled to a de novo review under the statute. *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986) (per curiam). An objection, however, “does not oblige the district court to ignore the report and

recommendation.” *Pharmacy Recs. v. Nassar*, 465 F. App’x 448, 456 (6th Cir. 2012). An objection requires the district court to give “fresh consideration to the finding objected to insofar as the objection impugns the integrity of the finding.” *Id.*

Plaintiff’s remaining claim turns on whether the terms of a settlement agreement required the parties to keep not just the terms of the agreement confidential, but also the very existence of any settlement confidential. The Magistrate Judge concluded that the confidentiality provision did not preclude the parties from communicating the fact that they settled. The Magistrate Judge also concluded that Plaintiff’s attorney was the first to disclose the amount of the settlement in papers filed in the state-court lawsuit.

Plaintiff objects. Plaintiff contends the agreement required the existence of the settlement itself to be kept confidential.

The Court has carefully reviewed Plaintiff’s objection and overrules the objection. The Court concludes the Magistrate Judge identified the correct legal standards and the relevant facts. Plaintiff’s disagreement with the R&R amounts to a disagreement with the application of the law to the facts. The Court agrees with the analysis in the R&R. The other arguments raised in Plaintiff’s objection do not address any finding of fact or conclusion of law in this report and recommendation.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 84) and **GRANTS** Defendant Nationwide’s motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 72). **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Date: April 4, 2025

/s/ Paul L. Maloney
Paul L. Maloney
United States District Judge